

**REMARKS**

***Telephonic Examiner Interview***

Examiner Etienne Pierre Leroux and the undersigned conducted a telephonic interview on August 10, 2009. The examiner stated that the present remarks with regard to claims 25-27 were sufficient to address the present claim objections. Further, claim 1 was discussed. No agreement was reached as to claim 1.

***Claim Objections***

The examiner objects to claims 25-27, stating that claims 25-26 must be designated as canceled and claim 27 depends from a canceled claim. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 25 and 26 were inadvertently omitted from the listing of claims in the reply filed on October 16, 2008, but that they were never cancelled, as the remarks of that reply state, “Claims 1-4 and 6-43 are pending in the present application. Claim 5 is cancelled.” Applicants have ensured that those claims appear in the present listing of claims.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-15, 19-24, 27, 29-35 and 39-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Haneda (Pat. No. 6,483,602). Additionally, in the telephonic interview of August 10, 2009, the examiner stated that claims 26-27 (which were not addressed as rejected or allowed in the present Official Action, due to the above claim amendments) stand rejected over Haneda as they were in the Official Action of June 16, 2008.

Claim 1 recites, “determining that at least one file contained on the storage medium has been added or deleted; and updating the database to reflect each added or deleted file.” The examiner states that this recitation is taught by Haneda in Fig. 15, col. 21, lines 45-60, Fig. 5, and col. 16, lines 25-35. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The discussion of Haneda Fig. 15 and col. 21, lines 45-60, appears to disclose storing an association between a roll of film and files stored on the user’s disk: “the user’s disk has

an information file for managing all of the data recorded on the disk ... the information file includes ... film descriptions ... one for each roll of film," col. 21, lines 48-60.

The discussion of Haneda Fig. 5 and col. col. 16, lines 25-35, appears to disclose affixing a label to a storage medium after the images stored on that storage medium have already been stored on the user's disk, and a unique label for that storage medium has been determined: "When digital images from several rolls of film have been recorded on the user's disk ... labels LB1, LB2, LB3 ... created for respective ones of the film rolls are affixed to the disk case of the user's disk..." col. 16, lines 28-32.

Haneda, in those cited portions, as well as in the reference as a whole, appears to disclose only adding the unchanging contents of a new roll of film to the information file on the user's disk when that roll of film is first introduced to the database. Since a file cannot be added or deleted to Haneda's roll of film, applicants respectfully submit that Haneda fails to disclose both, "determining that at least one file contained on the storage medium has been added or deleted," and "updating the database to reflect each added or deleted file."

Claim 1 also recites, "determining whether or not the storage medium has been assigned a unique volume label and a unique label identifier." The examiner states that this is taught by Haneda at col. 20, lines 25-30:

...disk would be used. The identification code read from the user's disk or included in the order data transmitted via the communication line is compared with the identification code attached to the image data preserved on the lab's disk in the laboratory system.

The examiner further states that the present "storage medium" reads on Haneda's "user's disk" (col. 15, lines 10-20) and the present "unique volume label reads on Haneda's "processing serial number," (col. 15, lines 35-40). Applicants respectfully disagree that these citations teach "determining whether or not the storage medium has been assigned a unique volume label and a unique label identifier."

Haneda at col. 20, lines 25-30 does not teach determining whether or not an unique volume label and a unique label identifier has been assigned, as is recited in claim 1, but instead teaches merely reading a code, regardless of whether or not it is unique ("The

identification code read from the user's disk ... is compared"). For these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that Haneda does not anticipate claim 1.

For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Haneda. Likewise, respective dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-14, 40, and 43 are also not anticipated at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Claim 20 makes similar recitations as claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is in condition for allowance for at least similar reasons to those analyzed with respect to claim 1, *mutatis mutandis*. Additionally, respective dependent claims 21-27, 29-34, and 41 are patentable over Haneda at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 20.

Claim 15, as amended, recites, "determining an external storage medium upon which the label is affixed." Applicants respectfully submit that Haneda neither teaches nor suggests at least this amended language. For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is not rendered obvious by Haneda and Pond. At least by virtue of dependence from claim 15, dependent claims 16-19, and 42 are likewise not rendered obvious.

Claim 35 makes similar recitations as claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 35 is in condition for allowance for at least reasons similar to the reasons presented with respect to claim 15, *mutatis mutandis*. Respective dependent claims 36-39 are likewise .

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

Claims 9 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haneda in view of Pond et al (Pat. No. 4,864,616).

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 9 and 28 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 20, respectively, are in condition for allowance.

**DOCKET NO.:** \*\*19-0088  
**Application No.:** 09/941,072  
**Office Action Dated:** July 20, 2009

**PATENT**

Date: October 20, 2009

/Peter Trahms-Neudorfer/  
Peter Trahms-Neudorfer  
Registration No. 59,282

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439